DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 384 HE 021 248

AUTHOR Birnbaum, Robert
TITLE Individual Preferences and Organizational Goals: Consistency and Diversity in the Futures Desired by Campus Leaders. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Baltimore, MD, November 21-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrators; *College Faculty; *College Presidents; *Goal Orientation; Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; Leadership; *Organizational Objectives; Trustees
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

The extent to which formal campus leaders shared consistent goals was investigated during 1986-1987, along with the relationship between presidential communications and goal consistency. Four concerns were examined: the expressed goals of college presidents; the extent of agreement (goal consistency) or disagreement (goal diversity) between presidents and other campus leaders; organizational characteristics that are related to goal consistency or diversity; and how campus constituents see and experience their presidents as creating and/or communicating goals and how this perception is related to goal consistency or diversity. For the sample of 32 colleges and universities, interviews were conducted with 119 formal campus leaders: 26 board chairpersons, 32 presidents, 29 academic vice presidents, and 32 faculty leaders (faculty senate presidents or faculty union presidents). Analysis of the content of the 119 responses led to the development of seven categories of goal: qualitative, quantitative, access/equity, educational program, special interest, institutional process, and external relations. Five data tables are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED292384

INDIVIDUAL PREFERENCES AND ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS: CONSISTENCY AND DIVERSITY IN THE FUTURES DESIRED BY CAMPUS LEADERS.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Birnbaum

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Robert Birnbaum
Associate Director
National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance

Professor of Higher Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

HE021248

Presented at the National Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Baltimore, Maryland, November 21-24, 1987.

This document was prepared pursuant to a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement/Department of Education (OERI/ED). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the OERI/ED and no official endorsement by the OERI/ED should be inferred.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Sheraton Inner Harbor Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland, November 21-24, 1987. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

ABSTRACT

This study develops the hypothesis that institutional goal consensus may not always support institutional effectiveness, and that goal diversity may serve important organizational functions. Content analysis is used to categorize goals identified in semi-structured interviews of persons in leadership roles within a national purposive sample of institutions of different types. The study analyzes the effects of organizational characteristics, institutional roles, and communications processes on the development of either consistent or diverse goals between and among campus leaders in colleges and universities.

Individual Preferences and Organizational Goals: Consistency and Diversity in the Futures Desired by Campus Leaders.

This is a study of the extent to which formal campus leaders (board chairs, presidents, academic vice presidents, and faculty senate presidents or faculty union presidents) at colleges and universities share consistent goals. The study also considers the relationship between presidential communications and goal consistency. The construct of "goal" is operationalized through the responses of leaders who are asked to specify how they would like their institution to change in the future.

The study is concerned with four questions. First, what are the expressed goals of college presidents? Second, to what extent is there agreement (goal consistency) or disagreement (goal diversity) between presidents and other campus leaders in different roles? Third, what organizational characteristics appear to be related to between-role goal consistency or diversity within institutions? Fourth, how do campus constituents see and experience their presidents as creating and/or communicating goals, and how is this perception related to goal consistency or diversity?

Organizations and Goals

The concept of organizations as goal-attaining systems is so fundamental that it has been referred to as "the goal paradigm" (Georgiou, 1973). This paradigm has influenced our understanding of college and university management and governance, and studies of higher education institutions often emphasize the importance of developing, articulating, and implementing organizational goals (Fenske, 1980). Administrators are told (Richman and Farmer, 1976) that to be effective they should "figure out what the goal system really is, and what the priorities within it really are" (p.137) because "until you know what goals are being reached for, it is rather difficult to determine what should be done to achieve them" (p.135). The articulation of goals is considered essential to "ensure unanimity of purpose within the organization" (Morrison, Renfro, and Boucher, 1984, p.80), and to "keep the organization from drifting into an uncertain future" (Kotler and Murphy, 1981, p.478).

But while the supposed relationship between goals and achievements appears plausible, the concept of "organizational goals" is highly problematic. It appears to assume that the preferences of individuals can somehow be aggregated into consistent rankings of collective

values, even though such aggregations are technically not possible (Arrow, 1982). It avoids confronting the fact that administrators and faculty simultaneously endorse numerous and conflicting goals (Gross and Grambsch, 1974; Doucette, Richardson, and Fenske, 1985). Although the importance of goals may be stressed by some analysts, institutional goal statements do not appear particularly useful for directing activities and behavior (Sheehan, 1980).

In common usage, "organizational goals" often refers not to collective preferences but to the values and objectives of upper level participants (Simon, 1964) which are then presumed to constrain the choices of others lower in the organization. This definition simplifies the problem of goal definition to some extent, but still suffers from two weaknesses. First, even the espoused goals of organizational leaders are themselves usually multiple, conflicting, and ambiguous, and do not specify the activities required to implement them (Perrow, 1979, p. 156). Second, while equating institutional goals to the espoused goals of leaders may be reasonable in some centralized and hierarchical organizations, colleges and universities in contrast are often composed of multiple constituencies that each claim legitimacy to influence goals, purposes, or mission.

These problems suggest that in higher education, relating leader preferences to organizational goals requires expanding the definition of "leader" to include other senior administrators and faculty in formal leadership roles, in addition to presidents or trustees. It would be expected that people in different parts of the institution, at different levels, and in different roles performing different tasks, would ordinarily prefer different outcomes, thus leading to goal diversity. Disagreement on goals could be expected to inhibit the optimization of any of them. Under certain conditions, however, there might be closer agreement in the preferences of leaders in different roles, and such goal consistency might be expected to increase the likelihood of their achievement. This study will examine such conditions, including the organizational characteristics and presidential behaviors associated with goal consistency.

Data Sources and Methodology

The data for this study were drawn from responses to intensive, open-ended, semi-structured interviews conducted at a purposive (Seltis, et. al., 1976; Williamson, et.al., 1982) national sample of 32 colleges and universities during the 1986-7 academic year. The institutions include equal numbers of public community

colleges, four-year state colleges, four-year independent institutions, and research and doctoral universities.

Respondents included persons in four, formally identified leadership roles on campus; board trustee chairperson, president, academic vice president or comparable position, and faculty senate chairperson (or president of the faculty union if no senate existed). The total sample of 119 included 26 board chairpersons, 32 presidents, 29 academic vice presidents, and 32 faculty leaders. Content analysis was used to assess interview responses of these campus leaders to the following question:

> In what ways do you hope [the institution] will be different five years from now than it is today.

Previous studies of the goals of academic leaders (see for example Gross and Grambsch, 1974; Doucette, Richardson, and Fenske, 1985) have tended to rely upon questionnaire responses to fixed lists of possible goals. While this approach has many strengths, it has weaknesses as well. The range of responses may be limited by the categories included on the list, responses may be more reflective of officially approved mission statements or socially accepted values than they are of the outcomes and futures actually preferred by the respondent, and respondents are able to indicate support for large numbers of goals while ignoring the potential conflicts between them.

In contrast, this research relied upon responses to an open-ended interview question that attempted to elicit individual "goals" without providing external cues. For the purpose of this study, a goal was considered to be a desired future condition identified by a respondent. Each goal named was coded as a discrete data element; elements were then aggregated and ordered into successively more abstract structures.

Categories of Goals

Analysis of the content of the 119 responses led to the development of seven different categories of goal; qualitative, quantitative, access/equity, educational program, special interest, institutional process, and external relations. Although the categories were developed based on responses from all four groups, the specific examples that follow all come only from college presidents.

> Qualitative goals emphasized maintaining or increasing the calibre or merit of specific institutional resources or programs. Specific responses called for "smarter students," "a strong

academic program," or "better faculty;" more general responses spoke of "growth in quality across the board."

Quantitative goals focused on the need for maintaining or increasing the amount of resources of various kinds available to the institution, such as student enrollments, additional programs, new facilities, increased research, or more funding or endowment.

Access/equity goals referred to providing educational opportunities for students (particularly minority students and adults), or filling professional or faculty positions with candidates from under-represented groups. They were reflected in such desired changes as to "take people of diverse backgrounds and ...bring them to a level of effectiveness" or to "have a minority student population that exceeds the proportion in the population of this city."

Educational program goals spoke of matters related to teaching and learning, such as curriculum, student development, faculty development, and the uses of technology. Presidents hoped that "student development will be full-blown," that the institution would "do more about the humanities," or that "the core curriculum will have stabilized."

Special interest goals included specific academic or administrative programs that respondents wished to develop. These might include plans for a building (a library or gymnasium, for example), enrichment of a specific instructional department, or support for a particular academic or administrative program (sometimes one that had been initiated by the president or with which the president had become personally associated). This category also included personal goals related to salary, workload, and other perquisites identified by several faculty respondents.

Institutional process goals referred to structures, perceptions, and relationships as reflected in governance, management, morale, mission clarity, and similar issues. Representative goals were that "the fight over governance [will be] over," that the institution will "be more tolerant of differences" or "will find its direction," or that the president would be able to "clarify the responsibilities of the deans."

External relations goals focused upon publicity, recognition, prestige, and interactions with important groups outside the institution. For example, presidents referred to developing "closer relations with the community," hoped that "the

perception of the public of us will be improved," and desired a "greater national prominence."

The Goals of Presidents. The 32 presidents identified 132 goals, an average of 4.1 per president. The distribution of presidential goals included in one or more of the seven categories is shown in Table 1. Responses have been separated into three categories to highlight significant discontinuities in the distribution of responses.

Table 1 about here

The most prevalent presidential goals were quantitative in nature. Presidents wanted "more." Over 80 percent of the presidents were concerned with maintaining or increasing quantity of resources, with particular attention given to facilities and equipment (13), and financial support (12). Even though widespread public attention has been given to enrollment issues, only six presidents identified stabilizing or increasing enrollments as an important goal.

Another four categories of goals were considered important by many presidents, although they were cited with less frequency than were quantitative goals. Two of these, qualitative goals and educational goals, were each identified by about half the presidents. The primary qualitative emphasis was upon "better" programs (9) and faculty (7). Only two presidents emphasized changes desired in student quality. Educational goals were spread over many areas, with greatest interest in the liberal arts (5), student outcomes (4), and the use of computers and technology (4). Two other categories of goals were cited by about 40 percent of the presidents. One of these categories was related to internal institutional processes, and presidents commented among other things on their desire for improved governance processes (5), preservation of institutional distinctiveness (4), greater clarity of mission (3) and improved morale (3). The other category emphasized external relations, with emphasis on increasing publicity and institutional prestige (9) and improving relations with specific external constituencies (6).

The final two goal categories were identified by a small minority of presidents. Special interest goals tended to identify special "pet" projects (6), and access/equity goals (the category identified by the smallest number of presidents) emphasized the enrollment of minority students (3).

Presidential Goals and Institutional Types. Presidents in institutions of different types (university, state college, independent college, community college)

tended to have similar patterns of quantitative goals, but differences in all others. The distribution of presidential goal categories by institutional type is shown in Table 2.

Quantitative goals were the only ones found with equal frequency among all institutional types. Between-type differences were found for each of the other goal categories. Compared with those in other institutions,

---

Table 2 about here

---

community college presidents were less likely to have qualitative and institutional process goals, and more likely to have access goals. State college presidents were the most likely to have external relations goals, and independent college presidents the least likely.

Goals and Roles. In addition to assessing the expressed goals of 32 presidents, this study analyzed the responses of 87 other persons in leadership roles on their campuses. A comparison of goal categories by role is shown in Table 3.

Table 3 about here

For all four role groups, quantitative goals were the most frequent, qualitative goals were either the second or third most frequent, and access/equity goals were the least frequently expressed. Board members were less concerned than other groups with institutional process goals, as might be expected because of their structural separation from internal institutional dynamics. Both board members and faculty leaders were less likely than presidents and vice presidents to indicate concern either for educational goals or for external relations. These differences may have been related in part to roles, or to the fact that on average board members and faculty expressed fewer goals (2.9 each) than did presidents and vice presidents (4.1 and 4.0 respectively).

Goal Consistency

In this study, goal consistency refers to the extent to which goal categories of presidents are shared by campus participants. Consistency was assessed in two ways. First, responses in each goal category were analyzed on a campus-by-campus basis to determine the extent to which having a goal stated by a president was related to the statement of that goal by others. Second, a consistency index was developed for each campus to determine whether greater or lesser goal consistency were related to specific presidential or organizational characteristics.

Presidential Goals and Campus Agreement. On average, more people were likely to identify a goal category on those campuses at which the president also identified the category than on those campuses where the

---

Table 4 about here

---

president did not. The data are shown in Table 4. When a president identified a goal category, on average 1.19 other respondents on that campus also mentioned it. When the president did not mention a category, only 0.69 respondents on campus did so. This aggregate tendency was true for six of the seven individual goal categories as well; the number of respondents mentioning the seventh category (educational) was the same whether or not the president specified this as a goal category. The differences in some cases was small, but the tendency for respondents to concur with presidential goal categories was consistent.

Factors Related to Goal Consistency. A Goal Consistency Index (GCI) was developed for each campus by adding the number of times any campus respondent mentioned a goal category, and dividing by the total number of categories mentioned. For example, if four campus respondents all mentioned the same goal category, and it was the only category mentioned, the GCI would be 4 (that is, 4/1) representing the highest possible degree of consistency. If four respondents all mentioned one goal category, and each was different, the GCI of 1 (or 4/4) would represent the lowest degree of consistency. The average GCI for the sample of 32 campuses was 1.91, with a range of 1.40 to 3.00.

The relationship between goal consistency and other institutional characteristics was assessed by analysis of variance. Independent factors examined included campus type (university, state college, independent college, community college), control (public, independent, religious), headcount enrollment (small under 2,500, medium between 2,500 and 10,000, and large over 10,000), tenure of president (new in office for three years or less, old in office for more than five years), collective bargaining (yes or no), and sex of president (male or female). The GCI was the dependent variable.

Differences in the GCI were statistically significant at the .05 level for only two of the factors, institutional type and sex of president. In order of increasing goal consistency, the GCI scores of institutional types were 1.73 for community colleges, 1.74 for universities, 2.02 for state colleges, and 2.14 for independent colleges $F(3,28)=3.68$, $p.<.03$. Goals were less consistent in 23 institutions with male presidents that had GCI scores of 1.82 than in 9 institutions with

female presidents and an average GCI of 2.11 $F(1,30)=5.42$, $p.<.03$.

Goal Consistency and Goal Communication

If presidential goals are to influence others, they must be communicated to them in some way. How do the communications processes that presidents are seen as using related to campus goal consistency? Faculty and academic vice presidents responded to the following question:

> How does the president communicate the [institution's] goals to you?

Their replies were analyzed and categorized into five major areas. Written materials included the preparation and circulation of documents of various kinds. On some campuses this included traditional comprehensive material such as mission statements, goals statements, or institutional plans. Persons on other campuses mentioned that presidential goals might also appear in house organs, newsletters, position papers, reports, or student bulletins. Presidents also made their views known to the campus through personal interaction which could take any of several forms. Interaction could be informal, often characterized as one-on-one sessions or casual conversation in either work or social settings. It could also occur when presidents met with an individual on a scheduled basis, or participated as a member in formal meetings of cabinets or other committees at which the president's views were expressed. Public presentations referred to statements that presidents might make to internal or external audiences. In many cases, presidents were reported to make such statements at convocations or similar scheduled events, or at meetings of large representative bodies such as faculty senates. Derivative sources of presidential goals included hearing about the president's goals indirectly rather than directly, either through on-campus sources (often the administrative hierarchy), or through presidential statements reported in the media. Finally, on some campuses respondents indicated that presidents communicated goals through their behavior, that is, through the specific decisions that they made, or the way they allocated the budget.

Institutions in the study were divided into two groups of approximately equal size, based on whether their GCI was under 2.00 (low) or 2.00 and over (high). The frequency with which academic vice presidents and faculty leaders identified the president as communicating goals through each of these five processes is shown in Table 5.

Table 5 about here

The small numbers make analysis difficult, and the following generalizations should be considered as suggestive rather than definitive:

a) On campuses with low goal consistency, vice presidents and faculty leaders saw their presidents relying more on communicating goals through public statements and less on personal interaction than did those on campuses with high goal consistency.

b) Written statements were not the main sources of presidential goals on either high or low consistency campuses.

c) Although it was not common at campuses in general, where leaders came to understand the president's goals through presidential behavior, goal consensus was likely to be high.

Discussion

Studies of goals and organizational functioning in higher education - including this one - have an inherent conceptual weakness. Their results may indicate general agreement on principles, but it cannot be assumed that consensus on principles and values will lead to agreement on means (Lindblom, 1959), or that agreement on abstract goals will have any visible impact on actual behavior (Gross and Grambsch, 1974). It is for this reason that goal studies have for the most part not been helpful in understanding the organizational and management processes of colleges and universities (Doucette, Richardson, and Fenske, 1985).

This study has attempted to reduce somewhat the distance between abstract goals and actual behavior by defining goals through spontaneous statements of desired outcomes and changes, rather than through agreement with items on prepared lists. Nevertheless, the acknowledged differences between what people say and what they do, and the difficulty of assessing the relationship between espoused goals and organizational performance, suggest that any conclusions based on these data be considered with caution. Given this caveat, there are three generalizations that seem warranted by the data. Each generalization can be explained by alternative conceptual premises, but the data in this study do not provide evidence indicating which of the possible explanations for each of the three generalizations is the most plausible.

First, there is a relationship between presidential goals and the goals of other campus leaders. Others are more likely to identify a goal if the president also expresses it, and less likely to share it if a president does not. There are at least two alternative explanations for this relationship. One explanation is that presidents provide leadership through the articulation of goals that

focus the attention of others and capture their allegiance. This explanation suggests that goal consistency develops because of the influence leaders have over followers. The other explanation is that presidents must at least some extent understand and respond to the goals of others if they are to be successful. This explanation implies that goal consistency may occur as leaders adopt the goals of followers. This is consistent with the transactional view of leadership (Hollander, 1987) that suggests that leaders are constrained by the expectations of followers; espousing goals not consistent with those of the group could lead to a loss in the leader's status and forfeiture of the claim to leadership.

The second generalization is that goal consistency appears related to institutional type. Leaders in universities and community colleges have the least consistent goals, and leaders in independent institutions the most consistent. It may be argued that goal diversity reflects confusion about the mission of certain institutions, and that both community colleges and universities would be more effective if their goals could be made more coherent and consistent. On the other hand, it is also possible that these institutions face environmental and programmatic constraints that are best managed through pluralistic goals. If this is true, certain types of institution may be effective <u>because</u> of inconsistent goals, rather than despite them.

The third generalization is that goal consistency is related to how followers see their leaders communicate. Goal consistency is low where people learn about a leader's goals through formal means, either written (plans, goal statements, newsletters, or other) or oral (listening to speeches). When people learn of a leader's goals through personal contact with the president, observing presidential behavior, or hearing informally what others in the institution's communication channels say about presidential goals, consistency is higher. One way of looking at this relationship is to infer that the use of interpersonal communication by leaders increases the degree to which leader's goals inspire others and influence goal consistency. Alternatively, it may be that the use of formal communications is a consequence, rather than a cause, of diversity in goals. When presidents find that diverse goals inhibit their attempts to influence others through informal interaction, they may increasingly rely on formal communications even though doing so may be more symbolic than instrumentally effective.

The Importance of Goal Diversity and Consistency

It is generally presumed that 1) goal consistency is good, and 2) administrative actions to make goals more

consistent will increase institutional effectiveness. In the absence of accepted criteria of institutional effectiveness it is impossible to know whether in fact these ideas are correct, and two hypotheses can be suggested that challenge them. First, seen on a continuum ranging from complete goal diversity to complete goal consistency, it can be suggested that either extreme places an organization at risk. On the one hand, commonality of goals is what transforms a collective of individuals into an organization; if all campus leaders have completely different goals, effective collaboration may be impossible. On the other hand, goals direct leaders' attention to certain internal and external cues and in the process of doing so make them insensitive to other cues; if all campus leaders have identical goals, they may become unable to detect changes in the environment that could pose serious threats to organizational survival. In considering organizational goals, as in other facts of organizational life, it is the tension between the opposites of consistency and diversity that prevents either from becoming extreme and therefore dysfunctional (Cameron, 1986).

Second, in the middle range, the optimum level of goal consistency may be a function of the stability of the institution's environment and the characteristics of its program, and should therefore be expected to differ among institutions and between institutional types. In institutions facing complex and potentially threatening environments, or offering many programs with inherently conflicting values, an emphasis upon goal diversity may be critically important; institutions that have simple program structures, and exist in a relatively stable environment, may find an emphasis on goal consistency to be advantageous.

Goal diversity increases the probability that different environmental cues will be attended to, and advocates will exist to support the needs of different programs. For example, in this study only 17 of the 32 presidents expressed qualitative goals. However, in 10 other institutions at least one other leader identified qualitative goals, indicating that such goals were likely to be considered at 27 of the 32 institutions in this study. As another example, access/equity was identified by at least one leader in ten institutions, although only by five presidents. If institutional programs consistent with the preferences of at least one leader are more likely of being attended to than those which are identified by none, goal diversity doubles the number of campuses at which issues of access might be considered in the course of institutional debate.

The dilemma of all institutions may therefore not be to maximize goal consistency but rather to find an

appropriate middle course. It is this middle course that maintains a necessary balance between the consistency required to work together, and the diversity necessary to ensure appropriate responses to the emerging demands of turbulent environments.

References

Arrow, K. J. "Current Developments in the Theory of Social Choice." In B. Barry and R. Hardin (Eds.), Rational Man and Irrational Society?, Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982.

Cameron, K. S. "Effectiveness as Paradox: Consensus and Conflict in Perceptions of Organizational Effectiveness." Management Science, 1986, 32, 539-553.

Doucette, D. S., Richardson, R. C. Jr., and Fenske, R. H. "Defining Institutional Mission." Journal of Higher Education, 1985, 56, 189-205.

Fenske, R. H. "Setting Institutional Goals and Objectives." In P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, and Associates, A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Georgiou, P. "The Goal Paradigm and Notes Towards a Counter Paradigm." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1973, 18, 291-310.

Glazer, B. G. and Strauss. A. L. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Grounded Research. New York: Aldine, 1967.

Gross, E. and Grambsch, P.V. Changes in University Organization, 1964-1971. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Hollander, E. P. "College and University Leadership from a Social Psychological Perspective: A Transactional View," 1987. Paper presented at the Invitational Interdisciplinary Colloquium on Leadership in Higher Education, Institutional Leadership Project, National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Lindblom, C. E. "The Science of 'Muddling Through'." Public Administration Review, 1959, 19, 78-88.

Perrow, C. Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay, Second Edition. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1979.

Richman, B.M. and Farmer, R.N. Leadership, Goals, and Power in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Selltiz, C., Wrightsman, L. S., and Cook, S. W. Research Methods in Social Relations, Third Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Sheehan, B. S. "Developing Effective Information Systems." In P. Jedamus, M. W. Peterson, and Associates, A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Simon, H.A. "On the Concept of Organizational Goal." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1964, 9, 1-22.

Williamson, J. B., Karp, D. A., Dalphin, J. R., Gray, P. S. The Research Craft: An Introduction to Social Research Methods, Second Edition. Boston: Little, Brown, 1982.

Table 1. Categories of goals of 32 college presidents.

Goal Category	Presidents N	Percent
Quantitative	26	81.2%
Qualitative	17	53.1
Educational	16	50.0
Institutional Process	13	40.6
External Relations	13	40.6
Special Interest	7	21.9
Access\Equity	5	15.6

Table 2. Goal Categories of 32 Presidents by Institutional Type (N = 8 for each type).

	Institutional Type				
Goal Category	University	State College	Independent College	Community College	Total
Quantitative	7	6	7	6	26
Qualitative	5	6	4	2	17
Educational	*	6	*	6	16
Inst. Processes	4	4	4	1	13
External Relations	4	6	1	2	13
Special Interests	3	2	1	1	7
Access/equity	*	*	*	3	5

* - at least one number in the row is "0." Entering actual numbers would permit identifying the responses of specific presidents, and therefore would breach the commitment of confidentiality made to each respondent.

Table 3. Goal Categories by Role.

	Role				
	Board Chair N=26	President N=32	Academic Vice-Pres. N=29	Faculty N=32	Total N=119
Goal Category					
Quantitative	15	26	18	18	77
Qualitative	14	17	14	10	55
Education	5	16	14	6	41
Inst. Processes	6	13	15	15	49
External Rel.	7	13	12	6	38
Spec. Interests	8	7	6	9	30
Access/Equity	2	5	5	4	16

Table 4. Average Number of Respondents sharing the Goal Categories Identified by the Campus President.

	President Identified This Goal?			
	Yes		No	
Goal Category	# Pres	Avg Other	# Pres	Avg Other
Quantitative	26	1.65	6	1.33
Qualitative	17	1.47	15	0.87
Educational	16	0.81	16	0.81
Inst. Process	13	1.08	19	0.95
Ex. Relations	13	0.92	19	0.68
Spec. Interest	7	0.86	25	0.68
Access/equity	5	0.60	27	0.22
	97		127	
Weighted Average		1.19		0.69

Table 5. How presidents communicate goals as seen by 30 academic vice presidents and 30 faculty leaders at 32 institutions, related to institutional goal consistency.

Goal Consistency	President Seen as Communicating by: writing	personal	public	derivative	behavior
Low <2.00 N=17	14	14	18	3	1
High 2.00 + N= 15	10	21	10	5	6
Total	24	35	28	8	7